IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE S.SIRI JAGAN

FRIDAY, THE 29TH JUNE 2007 / 8TH ASHADHA 1929

WP(C).No. 19937 of 2007(W)

---

PETITIONER:

---

1. K.M.IRSHAD HUSSAIN,
   MULLASERIL, KAYAMKULAM.

2. K.M.SAHIB HUSSAIN,
   MULLASSERIL,
   KAYAMKULAM.

3. K.M.NAUSHAD HUSSAIN,
   MULLASSERIL,
   KAYAMKULAM.

4. K.K.MUHAMMED,
   MULLASSERIL,KAYAMKULAM.

BY ADV. SRI.K.HARILAL
SRI.R.GOPAN

RESPONDENTS:

---

1. STATE OF KERALA, REPRESENTED BY THE
   SECRETARY,REVENUE DEPARTMENT,
   THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

2. TAHSILDAR,
   KARTHIKAPPALLY.

3. LAND REVENUE COMMISSIONER,
   PUBLIC OFFICE BUILDING,
   MUSEUM JUNCTION.

4. NASSER AHMED SIDIQUE,S/O.ABDUL KHADER,
   THATTAM VILAKOM,EDAVA,
   THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY GOVERNMENT PLEADER SRI. I.V. PRAMOD

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 29/06/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

**S. SIRI JAGAN, J.**

**----------**

**W.P.(C)NO.19937 OF 2007**

**----------**

**DATED THIS THE 29th DAY OF JUNE, 2007**

**JUDGMENT**

This writ petition relates to rival claims for mutation between the petitioners on the one hand and the 4th respondent on the other. The petitioners now apprehend that the respondents are likely to effect mutation of the subject property in the name of the 4th respondent. The petitioners have filed Ext.P19 objections in this regard before the 2nd respondent. For the present, the petitioners would be satisfied with a direction to the 2nd respondent to consider and pass appropriate orders on Ext.P19 expeditiously. The petitioners further submit that Ext.P19 objections may be considered while considering the revision filed by the 4th respondent which was directed to be considered as per Ext.P18 judgment.

2. Having heard the learned Government pleader and the learned counsel for the petitioner, I direct that while passing orders in implementation of Ext.P18 judgment on Ext.P12 application referred to therein the 2nd respondent shall consider Ext.P19 objections filed by the petitioners also after affording an opportunity to being heard to the petitioners as also the 4th respondent as expeditiously as possible. I

make it clear that without hearing the petitioners and passing a considered order the matter shall not be finalised.

The writ petition is disposed of as above.

**S. SIRI JAGAN, JUDGE**

Acd